

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. In particular, claim 5 has been amended to clearly recite the heat exchanger which serves to cool the purge gas from the gas contaminant cleaning system, prior to its passage to the cold head of the cryocooler, by heat exchange with contaminant containing gas from the storage space. This novel arrangement enables the invention to efficiently accomplish two objectives, namely refrigeration and contaminant cleaning. Support for the amendments to claim 5 is found in paragraphs 24 and 25 as well as in Figure 3. Claims 6 and 10 have been cancelled and new claims 12 and 13 have been added. Support for each of new claims 12 and 13 is found in paragraph 25. Accordingly applicants respectfully submit that the amendments and new claims presented herein do not comprise new matter.

The Rejection

The claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prasad (U.S. 5,308,382) in view of Laskaris et al. (U.S. 6,442,949). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Neither Prasad nor Laskaris et al. discloses or suggests a heat exchanger which receives gas from a gas contaminant cleaning system, such as an ejector, prior to the passage of that gas to a cryocooler, and which receives gas from a storage space or other location prior to the passage of that gas to the gas contaminant cleaning system. It follows that the combination of Prasad and Laskaris et al. fails to disclose or to suggest the claimed invention. Moreover, the combination of Prasad and Laskaris et al. would not result in a system such as the invention for efficiently providing both refrigeration and contaminant cleaning to a storage space. Indeed, applicants respectfully submit that since Laskaris et al. does employ a heat exchanger but places the heat exchanger at a location which is not between the ejector and the cryocooler nor between the load and the ejector, Laskaris et al., fairly read, teaches away from applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Prasad and Laskaris et al.

Applicants acknowledge the recitation of Bonaquist et al. (U.S. 6,477,847), Laskaris et al. (U.S. 6,438,969) and Zlobinsky (U.S. 5,003,787) which were not applied against the claims. Suffice it to say that none of these references discloses or suggests the claimed invention.

Since the prior art fails to disclose or to suggest the claimed invention and, moreover, teaches away from the claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is patentable over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all of the pending claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Stanley Ktorides
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 29,399

Danbury, Connecticut 06810

MARCH 30, 2005
(203) 837-2178
D-21372